

GELLIANA *

1.6.2 *si sine uxore <vivere> possemus, Quirites, omnes ea molestia caremus; sed quoniam ita natura tradidit ut nec cum illis satis commode nec sine illis ullo modo vivi possit, salutis perpetuae potius quam brevi voluptati consulendum est.*

From a speech *de prole augenda* which Gellius attributes to Q. Metellus Numidicus cens. 102 BC.

"Nature has ordained" (Rolfe); "la nature a imposé aux générations" (Marache); "la natura ha disposto" (Bernardi-Perini). These translations of *tradidit* merely show that the word is corrupt (it receives no support from the passages which keep it company in *OLD* sense 10d). In "AC" 55, 1986, 328f., I proposed to replace it with *providit*. It now seems to me that *prae-stiitit* would be more probable (*OLD* sense 12); for the corruption compare Nemesianus, *Ecl.* 1.78, where *praestabit* is very probably the word which has been corrupted to *tractabit*.

1.22.16 *sed invenimus in tertio Enni "Annalium" in hoc versu, "inde sibi memorat unum super esse laborem", id est relicum esse et restare, quod quia id est divide pronuntiandum est, ut non una pars orationis esse videatur sed duae.*

Madvig (*Adv.* 2.589) roundly condemned *quia id est* as devoid of meaning, a judgement which is confirmed by the attempts of the translators to import some semblance of meaning into it; he wished to substitute *quidem*, an old conjecture. This may well be the right solution (it is certainly much better than the other two conjectures reported by Marshall, *qua id est* and *quando est*), but perhaps one should pay more attention to the idea (never mentioned nowadays) of J. F. Gronovius, that the text has lost a Greek adverb like *διηρημένως* or *διαιρετικῶς*, to which either Gellius himself or "aliquis interpres" has added the explanatory phrase *id est divide*. Developing this idea of his father, Jac. Gronovius suggested that the Greek adverb has not been lost but stands there in the text disguised as *quia*, the adverb in question being *δίχα*; but he produced no evidence to show that that word was ever used in the sense of *divide*.

(*) The following modern editions of Aulus Gellius are referred to: Hosius (1903); Rolfe (Loeb edition, 1927-28); Marache (Budé edition, 1967-89); Marshall (OCT, 1968); Bernardi-Perini (1992).

I am very grateful to Dr L. A. Holford-Strevens for commenting most helpfully on an earlier version of these notes.

2.1.2 *stare solitus Socrates dicitur pertinaci statu perdius atque pernox a summo lucis ortu ad solem alterum orientem inconivens immobilis.*

It is usual to take *summo* in the sense of *primo* ("dal primo sorgere della luce", Bernardi-Perini), but that is surely impossible; *a summo ortu* must mean "from the end of his rising", "from the time when his rising was complete". In support of this one might adduce Lygdamus 4.21 *summo Phoebus prospexit ab ortu*, but there *ortu* was convincingly emended by Markland to *Oeta*. In our passage it is unlikely that Socrates should be said to have waited until the sun had fully risen before beginning his rigid stance; the sense we want is just "from one sunrise to the next", and no qualification of "sunrise" is appropriate. I therefore suggest that *a summo* be replaced by *ab uno*, corresponding to the following *alterum*.

2.13.5 *atque inde infra de eodem Graccho ita scripsit* (sc. Sempronius Asellio): "*orare coepit id quidem, ut se defenderent liberosque suos*".

For the feeble *id quidem* I regard Gronovius's *inquit* as a certain emendation, although no editor has had the courage to adopt it. A similar superfluous *inquit* is common in Gellius; e.g. 2.22.3 *tum Favorinus ita fabulatus est: "satis" inquit "notum est"* e.q.s.; 3.1.12 *tum ille ita respondit non hercle inscite: "quisquis" inquit "est"* e.q.s.; 10.23.4 *verba M. Catonis adscripsi ex oratione...: "vir" inquit "cum divortium fecit"* e.q.s.; 13.11.6 *his enim verbis utitur: "bellaria" inquit "ea maxime"* e.q.s.; 13.12.5 *verba ipsa super ea re Varronis adscripsimus: "in magistratu" inquit "habent"* e.q.s.; 15.31.4 *mittunt... legatos cum his verbis: "quae, malum", inquit "ratio"* e.q.s.

2.28.4 *sed de lunae solisque defectionibus, non minus in eius rei causa reperienda sese exercuerunt. quippe M. Cato, vir in cognoscendis rebus multi studii, incerta tamen et incuriose super ea re opinatus est.*

Gellius has just said that the ancient Romans were vague about the causes of earthquakes; he now says the same about eclipses; therefore *non minus* is either corrupt or incomplete. Even Marache is unhappy: he says that the connection of thought "*n'est pas très satisfaisante*", and half-heartedly suggests translating *sese exercuerunt* by "*ils eurent du mal*", a desperate expedient. Hertz proposed a lacuna (*non minus <inprospere>*), Scioppius the alteration of *non minus* to *non nimis*; neither proposal produces a satisfactory connection of thought with what precedes. It would be more satisfactory just to change *non minus* to *non magis*; for scribal substitution of opposites see Housman's note on Manilius 5.463.

4.9.13 *nam et gratia, si nimia atque inmodica, et mores, si multi atque varii, ... et fama, si magna et inquieta et invidiosast, neque laudabilia neque utilia sunt.*

Examples of adjectives formed with the termination *-osus* which have a bad sense: *gratiosus*, *morosus*, *famosus*.

I cannot see in what sense reputation (*fama*) can be called "restless" (Rolfe), "tourmentée (Marache), "inquieta" (Bernardi-Perini). I would emend to *inquinata* (the opposite corruption, of *inquieta(ta)* to *inquinata*, has occurred in the tradition of *Paneg.* 2.10.1); for *inquinare famam* see Livy 29.37.11, [Quint.], *Decl. min.* 344.6.

5.7.1 *lepide mi hercules et scite Gavius Bassus* e.q.s.

5.11.13 *Favorinus non mi hercule inscite* e.q.s.

In these two passages, and apparently nowhere else in extant Latin literature, *mi hercule(s)* has been transmitted instead of the usual *me hercule(s)* (I ignore passages like Plautus, *As.* 750, where *mi* is construed with another word in the sentence). Although *mi* is accepted by all modern editors (perhaps they think that Gellius was guilty of a false archaism), the older editors changed it to *me*, probably rightly.

9.13.13f. *id subito perdolitum est cuidam Tito Manlio, summo genere gnato, tantum flagitium civitati adcidere, e tanto exercitu neminem prodire. Is, ut dico, processit neque passus est virtutem Romanam ab Gallo turpiter spoliari.*

From the story of T. Manlius Torquatus and the Gaul, as told by Claudius Quadrigarius.

Mommsen was surely right to substitute *ilico* for *ut dico*, which is not supported by anything in the earlier part of the story. It is true that soon afterwards (§ 16) Quadrigarius has *ita, ut ante dixi, constiterunt*, but this refers quite clearly to § 14 *contra Gallum constitit*.

Spoliari is translated by Rolfe as "tarnished", by Bernardi-Perini as "vilipeso". It ought to mean "taken away", as in *dignitatem spoliare* (*OLD* sense 5c); hence, if the text is sound, *virtutem* must stand for *famam virtutis*, "reputation for valour". Damsté proposed *spurcari*, a word which Quadrigarius may well have used. Another possibility, I suggest, is *suggillari*, which, if written *sugillari*, is not so remote as it might seem from *spoliari*.

10.17.3 *est enim persona, quae hoc apud Laberium dicit, divitis avari et parci sumptum plurimum asotiamque adolescentis viri deplorantis.*

Adolescentis viri is an unexampled expression which was emended long ago by the humanists to *adulescentis filii*. This emendation is supported (a) by the last line of quotation from Laberius which follows (*nequam filium*), (b) by the frequency of the combination of *adulescens filius* (*TLL* 6.756.18 ff.); both *viri* and *filii* consist of 5 minims. No modern editor has had the courage to adopt this certain emendation; instead, they retain the impossible

viri and list various wild guesses in their critical notes.

13.10.3 *praeterea in libris quos ad praetoris edictum scripsit* (sc. Antistius Labeo) *multa posuit partim lepide atque argute reperta*.

To say that 'some' of Labeo's observations were witty and subtle is to damn with faint praise. It is not surprising that the most recent editors have adopted Damsté's *pariter* for *partim*; but that is not palaeographically easy, and the *pariter... atque* phrase is not very appropriate with *lepide* and *argute*, two words of very similar meaning. I think that this is another instance of the omission of the first of two parallel phrases or clauses introduced by *pars*; I suggest something like *partim <tralaticia, partim>* e.q.s. The appropriateness of *tralaticius* of anything connected with the praetor's edict is obvious; and the word forms a good contrast to *reperta*, of Labeo's own original contributions.

16.5.1 *pleraque sunt vocabula quibus vulgo utimur neque tamen liquido scimus quid ea proprie atque vere significant sed incompertam et vulgariam traditionem rei non exploratae secuti videmur dicere quod volumus quam dicimus*.

The last two words are very difficult to understand, as is shown by Rolfe's translation "we seem to say what we mean rather than say it". There must be a lacuna, e.g. *magis dicere quod volumus quam <intelligere quod> dicimus*, "to use the words we want to use rather than understand the words we use". Gellius frequently emphasizes the necessity of understanding the meaning of words; e.g. 16.9.2 *facilius reperias qui id verbum ostendent quam qui intellegant. ita plerique nostrum, quae remotiora verba invenimus, dicere ea properamus, non discere*; 17.13.9 *verbis quae non intelleguntur*.

17.9.8 *unus* (sc. surculus) *imperator in bellum proficiscenti dabatur, alterum domi magistratus cum iure atque cum signo habebant*.

Description of the Spartan σκυτάλη.

"Nihil est *cum iure*", says Madvig (*Adv.* 2.607), proposing *cum cura* instead, but the abstract *cura* makes a strange partner for the concrete *signo* ("seal"). This objection does not apply to Goettling's *cum loro*, which is also palaeographically good; but the language in which the next sentence describes both the *lorum* itself and the manner of its use suggests that it is there being introduced for the first time. One might expect mention of a container which could be sealed, e.g. *cum arca*.

19.7.6 f. *item quod rubentem auroram "pudoricolorem" appellavit et Memnonem "nocticolorem"; item quod forte dubitanter et ab eo quod est "sileo" "silenta loca" dixit*.

Laevius's linguistic innovations.

Hosius takes *forte* as Gellius's word, *dubitanter* as Laevius's (and so apparently Marshall, who prints *forte* "*dubitanter*"), but it is inconceivable that Laevius used *dubitanter* in any possible sense of *forte*. Rolfe and Bernardi-Perini take *forte* as Laevius's word and *dubitanter* as Gellius's explanation of it: "he used *forte* for 'hesitatingly'"; this use of *forte* (which Bernardi-Perini calls a "semantic *hapax*") is equally incredible. The right interpretation is given by Bulhart in *TLL* 5.1.203.36 (correcting Hay ib. 6.1132.71f.), and (by implication) in *OLD* s.v. *forte*, sense 4d: Laevius used *forte* "non usitato sensu vocis *fortuito* sed eodem quo *forsitan*", i.e. he used *forte* when he was not sure of his facts, in the sense of "perhaps".

19.8.18 "*harenas*" *αὐτὴν πλεονεξτικῶς dictas minore studio quaerimus, quia praeter C. Caesarem, quod equidem meminerim, nemo id doctorum hominum † dedit.*

Gellius thinks it is unnecessary to look for instances of the plural *harenae* because no one but Julius Caesar has faulted that form (cfr. § 6 *sed enim "harenas" parum Latine dici quis... alius* [sc. *praeter Caesarem*] *aut scripsit aut dixit?*). But this sense cannot be extracted from *dedit*. Hence H. Tränkle ("Hermes" 111, 1983, 112) proposed replacing *dedit* by *denegavit*, a change which is hardly convincing either palaeographically or in point of sense. In "AC" 55, 1986, 331, I suggested <*vitiosum*> *credit*. I still believe that a small lacuna is the answer, but I now think that <*vitio*> *dedit* would be more convincing; *vitio dare* without a dative of person expressed is used by Gellius at 17.1.11.

19.10.9 *nam nescio quid hoc* (sc. the word *praeterpropter*) *praenimis plebeium est et in opificum sermonibus quam *** notius.*

Spoken by a *grammaticus*.

The vulgate text adopts Carrio's supplement *quam* <*in doctorum hominum*>, a phrase which is found at 16.9.1. A simpler solution would be *quam* <*in nostris*> *notius*, where the loss of *nostris* is easily explicable by its similarity to *notius*.

20.1.11 *si homo in ius vocatus morbo aut aetate aeger ad ingrediendum invalidus est,... iumento imponitur atque ex domo sua ad praetorem in comitium nova funeris facie effertur. quam enim ob causam morbo affectus et ad respondendum pro sese non idoneus iumento adhaerens in ius adversario deportatur?*

Adversario may be taken as "dativus commodi" ("at the demand of his adversary", Rolfe), but <*ab*> *adversario* is very tempting; it was the summoner who provided the transport (§ 25 *qui in ius vocabit iumentum dato*).